



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/847,794      | 05/02/2001  | Jackie L. Huffman    | 8830                | 4912             |

26884 7590 09/16/2005

PAUL W. MARTIN  
LAW DEPARTMENT, WHQ-4  
1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD.  
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER

JARRETT, SCOTT L

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3623

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/847,794

Applicant(s)

HUFFMAN, JACKIE L.

Examiner

Scott L. Jarrett

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This **Final** Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment filed July 1, 2005. Applicant's amendment amended claims 1-18. Currently claims 1-18 are pending.

***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendment filed on July 1, 2005 with respect to amended claims 1-18 necessitated new ground(s) of rejection.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latimer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,857,567 in view of Berkson, U.S. Patent No. 6,049,779 and further in view of Nashner, U.S. Patent No. 5,980,429.

Regarding Claims 1 and 11 Latimer et al. teach a system and method for providing performance feedback to a cashier (operator, clerk, salesperson, employee, etc.) at a point-of-sale terminal (Column 1, Lines 52-63;) for the purpose of improving the operator's scanning technique and effectiveness (productivity, performance, efficiency, accuracy, etc.; Abstract; Column 1, Lines 52-63; Column 9, Lines 13-18).

More specifically Latimer et al. teach a system and method for providing feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale (POS) terminal comprising:

- measuring and displaying work session performance feedback directly to a cashier (clerk, salesperson, counterperson, operator, etc.) during and after a work session (i.e. real-time; Column 3, Lines 44-54; Column 6, Lines 51-63; Column 7, Lines 27-42; Figures 1-3, 10, Element 48; Figures 7-9, Element 20); and

- displaying to the cashier a performance report indicating the cashier's measured performance at the end of the work session (Column 6, Lines 51-63; Figure 4).

Latimer et al. further teach that it is old and well known that "existing systems may also include a monitoring system for measure the *scanning rate* of the operator." (i.e. the tasks comprising the number of items scanned per unit time, measuring the cashier's performance of work session tasks; Column 1, Lines 32-34).

Latimer et al. does not expressly teach displaying performance goals to the cashier at the start and/or the end of a work session as claimed.

Berkson teaches setting employee performance goals and displaying performance goals (targets, objectives, etc.) at the end of a work session, in an analogous art of providing operator performance feedback, for the purpose of motivating operators to meet performance goals (incentives; Abstract; Column 2, Lines 38-68; Column 3, Lines 1-12).

Berkson teaches that the system and method for providing feedback to an operator at a terminal (service terminal, computer, etc.) comprises:

- monitoring and measuring the operator's performance during a work session (shift, time period; performance data collection system, performance evaluation component; Column 2, Lines 43-45; Column 6, Lines 31-49; Figure 1, Element 26 as shown below; Figure 2, Element 60);

Art Unit: 3623

- generating a performance report at the end of the work session comparing the operator's measured performance with the performance goal ("At the completion of a call by the ACD agent, the system automatically generates measurements of the two monitored performance parameters.... and compares the performance measurements to established performance parameter standards", Column 3, Lines 1-10 and 45-50; Column 6, Lines 55-68; Column 9, Lines 35-40; Figure 2, Elements 60-62; Figure 3, Elements 80-84); and

- rewarding operators that achieve targeted performance level(s) wherein after receives the reward the operator is returned to the general application (system; Column 3, Lines 1-12, 5-68).

Berkson further teaches that the collection and reporting of operator performance metrics as well as systems for motivating operators based on performance feedback, including the display (at the employee's terminal) of an operator's current performance, is old and well known in the art (Column 1, Lines 21-68).




FIG. 1

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal as taught by Latimer et al. would have benefited from setting employee performance goals and displaying performance goals at the end of a work session in view of the teachings of Berkson; the resultant system enabling retailers (merchants, businesses) to enhance a cashier's overall performance by motivating the cashier to achieve their performance target (desired, standard, goal) performance goal (Berkson: Abstract).

Neither Berkson nor Latimer et al. teach displaying an operator's performance goal at the start of the work session as claimed.

Nashner teaches displaying performance targets/goals **prior** (e.g. prescribed goal) to and during a training session (time period, session, shift, activity, etc.), in an analogous art of operator performance feedback, for the purpose of motivating users ("A well accepted principle in education is that a trainee striving to achieve a clearly identified, objective goal while receiving periodic objective feedback relative to his progress is the best motivated.", Column 3, Lines 32-35; Abstract; "information is provided to the subject regarding goals of the training and how well the goals are being achieved.", Column 4, Lines 12-27; Figure 1).

More generally Nashner teaches a performance monitoring and feedback system and method comprising:

- creating individualized performance monitoring (training) program to achieve a performance target (prescribed goal; Column 4, Lines 43-60; Column 5, Lines 40-44; Figure 1);
- setting, measuring and displaying individually set performance metrics (e.g. number of tasks performed compared to an expected individual or group benchmark, accuracy, etc.; Abstract; Column 4, Lines 12-60; Column 5, Lines 1-18); and
- setting performance targets (benchmark, goal, etc.) based on an individual's previous/past performance or a group's historical performance (Abstract; Column 4, Lines 18-27).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale



Art Unit: 3623

terminal, with its ability to set, monitor and display in real-time a cashier's ability to meet performance goals, as taught by the combination of Latimer et al. and Berkson would have benefited from displaying at the start of the work session the cashier's target performance goal in view of the teachings of Nashner; the resultant system motivating the cashier to achieve the work session's performance target by clearly identifying the expected performance objective at the start of the session (Berkson: Abstract; Nashner: Column 3, Lines 32-35; Column 4, Lines 12-27).

Regarding Claims 2-3 and 12-13 Latimer et al. teach a cashier performance feedback system and method wherein the feedback (instructions, advice, teachings, etc.) is tailored to each individual operator based on historical scanning information (i.e. historical performance data for each individual cashier; Column 3, Lines 35-43).

Latimer et al. does not expressly teach the utilization of performance goals or subsequently setting individual performance goals as claimed.

Berkson teaches the setting, measuring and displaying of measured performance and performance goals for each operator ("The PDC can be programmed to monitor target performance parameters, or metrics, that are associated with each ACD agent's performance.", Column 6, Lines 36-38) in the analogous art of providing operator feedback (operator performance), for the purpose of motivating operators to meet performance goals (incentives; Abstract).

Berkson does not expressly teach that the operator performance goals are determined using historical performance data for each individual cashier as claimed.

Nashner teaches the creation an individualized performance-monitoring (training) programs wherein individual performance goals (benchmarks, prescribed goals, etc.) are individually set for each user (subject, operator, etc.; Column 4, Lines 43-60; Column 5, Lines 40-44; Figure 1) based on the individual's and/or group's historical performance (Abstract; Column 4, Lines 18-27), in an analogous art of performance monitoring and feedback for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of the individual training program (Column 4, Lines 18-27).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing performance feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal as taught by combination of Latimer et al. and Berkson would have benefited from providing individualized (customer, personalized, unique, etc.) performance feedback to cashiers by setting individual performance goals for each individual cashier based on their personal historical performance in view of the teachings of Nashner; the resultant system enabling users of the system to determine the effectiveness of the individual performance program (training) efforts (i.e. the ability of the training program to enable users to reach their performance goals; Nashner: Column 4, Lines 18-27).

Regarding Claim 4 Latimer et al. teach a cashier performance feedback system and method wherein the system (point-of-sale terminal, device, computer, etc.) runs a general point-of-sale application (software, code, program, etc.; Column 1, Lines 36-45; Column 2, Lines 37-68; Column 3, Lines 1-34; Figures 1-3, 6 and 8-10) and the performance report is integrated (part of, connected to, add-on, etc.) into the general point-of-sale system (application, terminal, code, device, etc.; Column 3, Lines 26-33; Column 8, Lines 66-67; Column 9, Lines 1-13; Figure 2).

Regarding Claims 5 and 15 Latimer et al. does not expressly teach displaying cashier performance goal information as claimed.

Berkson teaches setting operator performance goals and displaying performance goals (targets, objectives, etc.) at the end of a work session, in an analogous art of providing operator feedback (operator performance), for the purpose of motivating operators to meet performance goals (incentives; Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal as taught by Latimer et al. would have benefited from setting operator performance goals and displaying performance goals at the end of a work session in view of the teachings of Berkson; the resultant system enabling retailers (merchants,

Art Unit: 3623

businesses) to enhance a cashier's overall performance by motivating the cashier to achieve their expected performance target (Berkson: Abstract).

Neither Latimer et al. or Berkson teach displaying an cashier's performance goal after the cashier logs into (start of work session) system as claimed.

Nashner teaches displaying performance targets/goals **prior** (e.g. prescribed goal) to and during a training session (time period, session, shift, activity, etc.), in an analogous art of operator performance feedback, for the purpose of motivating users to obtain their performance goals (Column 3, Lines 32-35; Abstract; Column 4, Lines 12-27; Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal, with its ability to set, monitor and display in real-time a cashier's ability to meet performance goals, as taught by the combination of Latimer et al. and Berkson would have benefited from displaying at the start of the work session the cashier's target performance goal in view of the teachings of Nashner; the resultant system enabling retailers (merchants, businesses) to enhance an employee's overall performance by motivating the employee to meet target performance displayed at the start of the session (Berkson: Abstract; Nashner: Column 3, Lines 32-35; Column 4, Lines 12-27).

Art Unit: 3623

Nashner does not teach displaying an cashier's performance goal after the cashier logs into system as claimed.

Official notice is taken that operator sessions typically start with the operator logging onto the system enabling the system to recognize/authorize the operator to use the system.

It would have been obvious that the cashier performance feedback system and method as taught by the combination of Latimer et al., Berkson and Nashner, with its ability to display a cashier's performance goal at the start of a session, would have benefited from starting the session after the cashier logged onto the system in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system informing the cashier at the start of the work session (i.e. immediately following the cashier's logon) what their individual performance goal is for that work session thereby motivating the cashier to meet the set/prescribed goal (Nashner: Column 3, Lines 32-35; Column 4, Lines 12-27).

Regarding Claims 6-7 Latimer et al. does not expressly teach that the cashier performance feedback system (terminal, device, computer, etc.) returns to the general (main, default, etc.) point-of-sale system upon receiving input (button, keyword, mouse, etc.) from the cashier.

Official notice is taken that returning a user to their original task, activity, system or the like after receiving a response to a request for user input (i.e. pop-up window, dialog box, splash screen, etc.) is old and very well known.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system for providing performance feedback to a cashier, as taught by the combination of Latimer et al., Berkson and Nashner would have benefited from returning the cashier to the general point of sale application after displaying the cashier's performance goal in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system enabling the cashier to acknowledge the expected performance goal and start the work session.

Regarding Claims 8 and 16 Latimer et al. teach a cashier performance feedback system and method comprising the displaying, directly to the cashier, a performance report indicating the cashier's measure performance at the end of the work session (Column 6, Lines 51-63; Figure 4).

Latimer et al. does not expressly teach the setting of a performance goal or the subsequent displaying cashier performance goal information when the cashier logs out of the point-of-sale application (i.e. ends the work session).

Berkson teaches setting operator performance goals and displaying performance goals (targets, objectives, etc.) at the end of a work session, in an analogous art of providing operator feedback (operator performance), for the purpose of motivating operators to meet performance goals as discussed above.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal as taught by Latimer et al. would have benefited from setting operator performance goals and displaying performance goals at the end of a work session in view of the teachings of Berkson; the resultant system enabling retailers (merchants, businesses) to enhance a cashier's overall performance by motivating the cashier to achieve their expected performance goal (Berkson: Abstract).

Berkson does not teach displaying a cashier's performance goal after the cashier logs into system as claimed.

Official notice is taken that operator sessions typically end with the operator logging out of the system thereby enabling the system to recognize that the operator has completed their work session.

It would have been obvious that the cashier performance feedback system and method as taught by the combination of Latimer et al., Berkson and Nashner, with its

ability to display a cashier's performance goal at the end of a session, would have benefited from ending the session after the cashier logged out of the system in view of the teachings of official notice; the resultant system informing the cashier at the end of the work session how well they did during the current work session.

Regarding Claims 9 and 17 Latimer et al. does not expressly teach setting performance goals/targets for each cashier and is silent on the architecture of the system.

Berkson teaches setting performance goals for each operator as discussed above and that the operator performance feedback system and method has an multi-tiered architecture comprising a plurality of operator terminals (front-end, agent computing device, customer station), back-end subsystems (modules, components, applications) including but not limited to the performance data collection, evaluation and reward (motivator) subsystems, network database and a network connecting the various terminals and subsystems (layers of the system; Figure 1 as shown above; Column 5, Lines 57-68; Column 6, Lines 1-35), in an analogous art of performance monitoring and feedback for the purpose of motivating operators to achieve set performance goals.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing performance feedback to cashiers at a point-of-sale terminal as taught by Latimer et al. would have benefited from setting



Art Unit: 3623

performance goals for each cashier as well as utilizing a multi-tiered system architecture in view of the teachings of Berkson; the resultant system providing cashiers with feedback regarding the ability to achieve the set performance goals performance feedback relating to the cashiers achievement of a performance goal thereby motivating the employee to meet target performance metrics (Berkson: Abstract).

Regarding Claims 10 and 18 Latimer et al. does not teach setting of performance goals for each cashier and is silent on the architecture of the cashier performance feedback system and method.

Berkson teaches the setting, measuring and displaying of operator performance goals for each operator and that the system utilizes a multi-tiered (i.e. network, internet, etc.) architecture as discussed above.

Nashner teaches that a system administrator (user, "prescriber") creates individualized performance (training) programs for individual users wherein individual performance goals (benchmarks, prescribed goals, etc.) are set for each user (subject, operator, etc.; Column 4, Lines 43-60; Column 5, Lines 40-44; Figure 1) based on the individual's and/or group's historical performance (Abstract; Column 4, Lines 18-27), in an analogous art of performance monitoring and feedback for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of the individual training program (Column 4, Lines 18-27).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the system and method for providing performance feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal as taught by combination of Latimer et al. and Berkson would have benefited from providing individualized (customer, personalized, unique, etc.) performance feedback to cashiers by enabling a user (trainer, manager, supervisor, etc.) set and monitor individual performance goals for each individual cashier in view of the teachings of Nashner; the resultant system enabling users of the system to determine the effectiveness of the individual performance (training) efforts (i.e. the ability of the training program to enable users to reach their performance goals; Nashner: Column 4, Lines 18-27).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Larson, John, U.S. Patent No. 3,899,775, teaches a system and method for managing and monitoring retail transactions as part of a point-of-sale system. Larson further teaches that such systems "are capable of producing a variety of management reports on items such as inventory, sales rates and checker productivity."

- Collins, Donald, U.S. Patent No. 5,44,226, teaches a system and method for providing real-time scanning performance feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal.

Art Unit: 3623

- Zimmerman, Dennis, Nieman set to expand computer-based training, teaches the utilization of cashier performance feedback systems and methods for providing performance feedback to cashiers at a point-of-sale terminal wherein a plurality of performance metrics are measured and reported/displayed including but not limited to scanning spend and scan rate.

- Closing in on front-end shrink teaches the commercial availability and public use of systems and methods for monitoring the performance of cashiers in a point-of-sale system. The article further teaches the commercial available of a cashier performance monitoring system and method by Trax Software.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott L. Jarrett whose telephone number is (571) 272-7033. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00AM - 5:00PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hafiz Tariq can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
SJ

9/15/2005

  
**ROMAIN JEANTY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*Art Unit 3623*